

CERN-TH.6434/92
ENSLAPP-A-377/92

Comment on “High Temperature Fermion Propagator – Resummation and Gauge Dependence of the Damping Rate”

Anton Rebhan

*Laboratoire de Physique Théorique ENSLAPP¹
BP 110, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux CEDEX, France*

and

*Theory Division, CERN
CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*

ABSTRACT

Baier et al. have reported the damping rate of long-wavelength fermionic excitations in high-temperature QED and QCD to be gauge-fixing-dependent even within the resummation scheme due to Braaten and Pisarski. It is shown that this problem is caused by the singular nature of the on-shell expansion of the fermion self-energy in the infra-red. Its regularization reveals that the alleged gauge dependence pertains to the residue rather than the pole of the fermion propagator, so that in particular the damping constant comes out gauge-independent, as it should.

ENSLAPP-A-377/92
CERN-TH.6434/92
March 1992

¹URA 14-36 du CNRS, associée à l'E.N.S. de Lyon, et au L.A.P.P. d'Annecy-le-Vieux

During the last decade, there has been much controversy about perturbative QCD at high temperature, nurtured by contradictory results on the leading-order damping rates of plasma excitations, which, at the one-loop order, came out gauge-dependent in both magnitude and sign [1]. It had been surmised rather early that higher-loop orders are relevant for a complete calculation of the leading-order damping rates, but only rather recently has it been established that indeed a proper resummation cures both the reported gauge dependences and the wrong sign found in most one-loop calculations. On the one hand, Kobes, Kunstatter, and the present author [2] have proposed a formal argument [3] verifying the gauge independence of plasma dispersion relations once they have been evaluated completely, and, on the other hand, Braaten and Pisarski have developed a systematic procedure for a resummation of leading-temperature corrections (“hard thermal loops”) into an effective loop expansion where higher-loop orders are also of higher order in the coupling constant [5].

The whole issue is in fact not peculiar to nonabelian gauge theories, but can be studied already in QED, where the calculation of the damping rate of fermionic excitations equally requires resummation of all hard thermal loops.

The potential gauge dependence of the leading-order damping rate of long-wavelength fermionic excitations in high-temperature QED (or QCD) within the resummation scheme of Braaten and Pisarski has been scrutinized most recently by Baier, Kunstatter, and Schiff [6] with the surprising conclusion that there were in fact gauge-dependent contributions to the imaginary part of the high-temperature fermion propagator at order g^2T .

With Δ_f being the fermion propagator that resums the contributions of order gT , the part of the fermion self-energy proportional to the gauge parameter ξ , at order g^2T , reads [6]

$$\delta\Sigma(P) = \xi g^2 \Delta_f^{-1}(P) \int_{\beta} \frac{d^4K}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{K^4} \left[\Delta_f(P-K) \Delta_f(P)^{-1} - 1 \right]. \quad (1)$$

While gauge dependence appears to hold formally “on-shell” ($\Delta_f^{-1} = 0$) in accordance with the analysis of Ref. [2], the thermal integral in (1) develops on-shell poles which just cancel the explicit factors Δ_f^{-1} , giving a non-zero, gauge-dependent imaginary contribution to the on-shell value of the fermion self-energy, hence to the damping rate!

In order to highlight what exactly goes wrong in this calculation, it is sufficient to consider a partial resummation in the long-wavelength limit, where only a constant thermal mass is taken into account [7] by a resummed lowest-order Lagrangian for the fermions

$$\mathcal{L} = i\bar{\psi} \not{D} \frac{D^2 + m^2}{D^2} \psi, \quad (2)$$

where $m \sim gT$ is the thermal mass of fermionic modes in the long-wavelength limit. Since there appeared to be no problem with the contribution from the cuts of the full propagator, which are the main omission in (2), the same problem will show up in this simpler setting, together with its solution.

The gauge-invariant form of (2) guarantees that the resummed terms obey simple Ward identities, so that the gauge dependence of the fermion self-energy is again given by (1), which now more explicitly reads

$$\delta\Sigma(P)\Big|_{\mathbf{p}\rightarrow 0} = \xi g^2 \gamma_0 \left[\frac{\delta^2}{p_0^2} \int_{\beta} \frac{d^4 K}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{[K^2]^2} \frac{p_0 - k_0}{(P - K)^2 - m^2} - \frac{\delta}{p_0} \int_{\beta} \frac{d^4 K}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{[K^2]^2} \right], \quad (3)$$

where

$$\delta \equiv P^2 - m^2.$$

(Here the notation for 4-vectors is $K = (k_0, \mathbf{k})$, with metric $(+, -, -, -)$; $\int_{\beta}$ refers to evaluation at finite temperature.)

The usual trick to evaluate the double pole $1/(K^2)^2$ in (1) is to write

$$\frac{1}{[K^2]^2} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \frac{1}{K^2 - \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0}. \quad (4)$$

It is easy to see that, after this replacement, the integrals in (3) could not have any imaginary part on the “mass-shell” [$\delta = (p_0^2 - m^2) = 0$] for all $\lambda > 0$, owing to the lack of phase-space volume for the corresponding decay process. By continuity and intuition, one therefore would not expect any contribution to the damping rate from expression (3), the more so because the integrals in (3) are multiplied by explicit on-shell zeros. Yet, what the authors of Ref. [6] have found is that evaluating the integrals off-shell and setting $\lambda = 0$ after differentiation according to (4) does give rise to an imaginary part, which has a double pole on-shell, exactly compensating the on-shell zeros in $\delta\Sigma$. This leaves a non-vanishing, gauge-dependent contribution to the imaginary part of the dispersion relation!

Indeed, the order

$$\lim = \lim_{p_0 \rightarrow m} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \quad (5)$$

chosen in Ref. [6] seems perfectly natural, if the introduction of λ was just a technical device for the evaluation of the double pole $1/(K^2)^2$ [8] [9].

Still, the discontinuous behaviour with respect to this parameter λ , which looks suspiciously like an infra-red regulator, calls for a closer look at the infra-red behavior of the integrals in (3). Taking the order of the limits (5) for granted, the latter can be studied in a most clear-cut way by the introduction of an actual infra-red cut-off of spatial momenta, $|\mathbf{k}| \geq \mu$. Straightforward evaluation of the leading-temperature contributions to (3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Sigma(P)\Big|_{\mathbf{p}\rightarrow 0} &= \xi g^2 \gamma_0 \frac{T}{2\pi^2} \frac{\delta}{p_0} \left(1 - \frac{3\delta}{4p_0^2} + \frac{\delta^2}{4p_0^4} + \frac{\delta}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2p_0^2} \right)^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \right) I, \\ I &= \int_{\mu}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{k^2 - \delta^2/4p_0^2} = \frac{p_0}{\delta} \ln \frac{\mu + \delta/2p_0}{\mu - \delta/2p_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Without an infra-red cut-off ($\mu \rightarrow 0$), the logarithm in (6) becomes $i\pi$, and apparently a finite gauge-dependent imaginary contribution is added to the on-shell pole, which, basically, is the result found in Ref. [6]. However, keeping an infra-red cut-off and taking the on-shell limit one obtains instead

$$\ln \frac{\mu + \delta/2p_0}{\mu - \delta/2p_0} \rightarrow \frac{\delta}{p_0\mu} + O(\delta^3),$$

so that

$$\delta\Sigma(P)\big|_{\mathbf{p}=0} = \frac{\xi g^2 T}{2\pi^2 \mu} \frac{\delta}{p_0} \gamma_0 + O(\delta^2) = \frac{\xi g^2 T}{2\pi^2 \mu} \Sigma(P)\big|_{\mathbf{p}=0} + O(\delta^2). \quad (7)$$

Evidently, there is no longer a contribution to the pole of the full propagator, but only a (real!) contribution to the *residue* $\propto T/\mu$.

At $T = 0$, the residue of the fermion propagator is known to be both gauge-dependent and infra-red singular, which enforces the introduction of an infra-red cut-off to render the propagator well-defined [10]. The only difference at finite temperature is that the different infra-red behaviour due to Einstein–Bose factors changes the singularity in the residue from logarithmic to power-like. At $T = 0$, extraction of the gauge-independent mass counter-term does not encounter the need of an infra-red regulator, this becomes apparent only when one goes on to compute also the residue. But at finite temperature, without infra-red regularization, the linear divergence in the residue is able to fake a regular contribution to the pole. With an infra-red cut-off, the correction to the pole position at the resummed one-loop order, which gives the leading order to the damping rate, turns out to be both infra-red finite and gauge-independent.

In conclusion, the gauge-dependence problem of the resummation scheme of Braaten and Pisarski, encountered by Baier et al. in the leading-order evaluation of the damping rate of fermionic excitations in high-temperature QED and QCD, is resolved by the necessity of infra-red regularization of the on-shell expansion of the resummed self-energy contributions.

I am indebted to Rolf Baier, Randy Kobes, Gabor Kunstatter, Rob Pisarski, Dominique Schiff, and Hermann Schulz for correspondence, as well as Tanguy Altherr and Max Kreuzer for discussions.

References

- [1] For a review see e. g. R. Pisarski, Nucl. Phys. **A525**, 175c (1991).
- [2] R. Kobes, G. Kunstatter and A. Rebhan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2992 (1990); Nucl. Phys. **B355**, 1 (1991).
- [3] The formal argument of Ref. [2] in favor of gauge independence — which does not refer to the ill-defined [4] notion of an S -matrix at finite temperature — goes by relating the gauge variation of a plasma dispersion relation, say $a(p_0, |\mathbf{p}|) = 0$, to itself

times a certain Green function, $\delta a(p_0, |\mathbf{p}|) = a(p_0, |\mathbf{p}|)\delta X(p_0, |\mathbf{p}|)$, where the diagrammatic expansion of δX is one-particle-irreducible, except for Faddeev–Popov ghost propagation. At finite temperature, ghost dispersion relations are uncorrelated to physical ones, hence δX is not expected to develop poles simultaneously with $a = 0$.

- [4] H. Narnhofer, M. Requardt and W. Thirring, Commun. Math. Phys. **92**, 247 (1983).
- [5] R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1129 (1989); E. Braaten and R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 1338 (1990); Nucl. Phys. **B337**, 569 (1990); Phys. Rev. D **42**, 2156 (1990).
- [6] R. Baier, G. Kunstatter and D. Schiff, Bielefeld preprint BI-TP 91/38, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.
- [7] Such a partial resummation scheme has been developed for the case of gluonic excitations in: M. Kreuzer, A. Rebhan and H. Schulz, Phys. Lett. **B244**, 58 (1990); U. Kraemmer, M. Kreuzer, A. Rebhan and H. Schulz, Lect. Notes in Phys. **361**, 285 (1990).
- [8] A finite $\lambda > 0$, and with it gauge-parameter independence, could be provided by a modification of the kernel δ_{ab} in the inhomogeneous gauge-breaking term $(1/2\xi)(\partial_\mu A^\mu)^a \delta_{ab}(\partial_\nu A^\nu)^b$ according to $\delta_{ab} \rightarrow \delta_{ab}([\Box + \lambda]/\Box)^2$, so that λ enters as a second gauge parameter. However, the Landau part of the gauge propagator ($\xi = 0$) still contains a massless double pole. If the latter is again handled according to (4) and (5), the result would still differ from gauges such as the Coulomb or the axial one which do not have a double pole.
- [9] In a recent paper, Nakkagawa et al. [H. Nakkagawa, A. Niégawa and B. Pire, Palaiseau preprint CPTH-A092 (1992)] have repeated the calculation of Ref. [6] with slight variations. Noting that the gauge dependence of the result is sensitive to changing limits like those in eq. (5), they claim the resolution of the gauge-dependence problem. However, they choose a procedure leading to gauge independence by fiat, without any deeper justification.
- [10] C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980), ch. 7.1.2.